Mr. E. Ikkanda Warriar.—May I know what the Standing Order is?

Rama Varmha Tampuran.—That total service in all the departments will be considered to decide seniority among acting hands in a particular grade.

Mr. E. Ikkanda Warriar.—Was it made for the purpose of adjusting these cases?

Rama Varmha Tampuran.—That rule was passed to set right several inequalities that existed long ago.

Mr. E. Ikkanda Warriar.—May I know when it was passed? Was it when Mr. Warriar's case was considered?

Rama Varmha Tampuran.—It was passed four or five months ago.

Mr. E. Ikkanda Warriar.—When was this posting?

Rama Varmha Tampuran.—Two months back.

Mr. E. Ikkanda Warriar.—Was not this point also in consideration at that time?

Rama Varmha Tampuran.—This point was decided.

Mr. P. Kumaran Ezhuthassan.—May I know whether the notes to Standing Order No. 17 are still in force?

Rama Varmha Tampuran.—They are still in force; but they have to be read with the amendments to Standing Order No. 16.

Loss to the Sirkar by a sale of monopoly trees in Pothundi village.

301. Mr. A. Eachara Menon.—Will the Government be pleased to state:—

(1) whether it is a fact that the monopoly trees standing in Survey No. 727 of Pothundy village were sold in public auction to one Mr. S. Muhamed Rowther of Chittalanchery before the issue of Royal Proclamation regarding the monopoly trees;

(2) whether one Mr. V. K. Nayar complained that the trees were standing in his land and that no pass should be issued to Mr. Rowther for the transport of timber;

(3) whether the Conservator had not ordered that no pass should be issued and no timber transported;

(4) whether the claims of Mr. V. K. Nayar were considered and the trees given to Mr. Rowther;

(5) if not, what became of the timber felled by Mr. Rowther;

(6) what was the amount spent by the department towards the T. A. of the officers who had visited the spot in quest of the timber;

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

(7) who is responsible for the loss sustained by the Sirkar?

Mr. T. Narayana Menon.—(1) Yes.

(2) Yes.

(3) Yes, pending consideration of Mr. V. K. Nayar's claims.

(4) The claims of Mr. V. K. Nayar were considered and found to be untenable.

(5) In view of answer to sub-division (4), the question does not arise.

(6) Nil.

(7) The Sirkar has sustained no loss in the transaction.

Officers to whom enhanced pension was given by the Acting Diwan.

302. **Mr. Paul Mampilli.**—Will the Government be pleased to state.—

(a) whether any officer was given enhanced pension by the Acting Diwan;

(b) the names of the officers who were given such pension and the reason for giving them the same?

Rama Varmha Tampuran.—(a) Yes.

(b) 1. Mr. T. P. Venkitachala Ayyar, Revenue Inspector —for long and efficient service.

2. E. Govinda Menon, clerk, Mukundapuram Taluk Office—for his long service of 37 years.

3. A. Kittunny Menon, Parvathiyam —because of his local allowance had to be treated as duty allowance.

4. Mr. N. S. Subramania Ayyar, Sarvadhikariakar—his emoluments as ex-officio Manager of the V. T. K. Estate were considered as duty allowance.

Mr. Paul Mampilli.—Had any of these gentlemen applied for enhanced pension?

Rama Varmha Tampuran.—All these people did apply.

Mr. Paul Mampilli.—Was the petition of any of one of them rejected previously?

Rama Varmha Tampuran.—I do not think.

Mr. P. Kumaran Ezhuthassan.—May I know whether any Government servant, other than those working in the Revenue Department, barring of course No. 4, did apply for such exemption?

Rama Varmha Tampuran.—I want notice.

Mr. K. G Nayar.—Were there precedents for such cases?

Rama Varmha Tampuran.—Of course, there were several instances.

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly